

A

LECTURE

UPON THE

Coronation***

***Declaration

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

ORANGEMEN OF THE CITY OF OTTAWA

in Grace Church, July 9, 1899.

BY THE

REV. J. F. GORMAN, S. A. C.

Rector of Grace Church.

Fotheringham & Popham, Print.

RECEIVED

THROUGH THE

POST OFFICE

NEW YORK

NOV 10 1891

RECEIVED

A

LECTURE

UPON THE

Coronation***

***Declaration

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

ORANGEMEN OF THE CITY OF OTTAWA

in Grace Church, July 9, 1899.

BY THE

REV. J. F. GORMAN, S. A. C.

Rector of Grace Church.

"CORONATION DECLARATION."

My brethren of the Orange Order—It is with much pleasure that I bid you welcome to Grace Church, upon this holy day which next precedes the anniversary of that momentous event which you will celebrate as an order, next Wednesday ; an event, let me say, which meant so much and had such far-reaching effects, not only upon the immediate age in which the forces of tyranny and papal despotism joined issue with those of civil and religious freedom, at the waters of the Boyne, but also upon the ages since that time. When I study the history of your career my thoughts are carried back to times which witnessed great struggles and conflicts upon the issue of which depended the most vital of principles. Your order stands to-day, as it has always stood since its formation, for the inalienable rights of man, the rights of civil and religious liberty. It is scarcely necessary to say how completely and fully I endorse these principles of the Orange order, more especially so when I reflect that each member of that order binds himself not only to resist the encroachments and aggression of the papal power, but also to maintain that pure and Scriptural religion of apostolic times which was revived at the reformation. Every true Orangeman is pledged to the maintenance of true religion ; so that while on the one hand he protests, and protests vigorously, when occasion demands, he on the other hand makes a positive affirmation in the belief of the true and scriptural faith of the reformed Church. His true attitude therefore is not only resistance but also acquiescence. The steadfastness which he manifests in his opposition to error will be largely determined by his steadfastness to the principles of his own church.

It is therefore a source of pleasure and gratification to me to feel that I am addressing to-day a body of men whose first principle is to maintain true religion ; this places me at once in sympathy with my hearers.

I must confess to you that I was not a little surprised when I, a clergyman of the Anglican Communion, was singled out as a fit and proper person to preach to you to-day. The Anglican Church is attracting a good deal of attention at the present time, and from references made to her at large and representative gatherings of the Orange order, I infer that Orangemen are to be numbered amongst those who regard its new life and activity as savouring of Romanistic tendencies. It is not my purpose to-day, however, to enter upon a defence of the Church of England or to vindicate her against so unjust a charge, but this much I may be permitted to say, that whenever the liberty of the subject was at any time seriously menaced by papal aggression the Church of England has always placed herself in the very forefront of the battle. History is over and over again repeating in a sense the memorable siege of Derry. When the leader of the besieged was stricken down, it was a clergyman of the Irish Church, the

Rev. Mr. Walker, who stepped into his place and became the recognized leader in his stead and after great hardships and sufferings Derry triumphed. And the Church of England is, I am convinced, as true and loyal to the essential principles of the Reformation to-day as she was when those principles first dawned upon the world. My passport to your confidence lies largely, no doubt, in the attitude which I assumed during a recent attack upon the Church of England and protestants generally by a Roman Priest of this City when I ventured to take up the cudgels in the church's defence.

When I was requested to address you, it suggested itself at once to me that the Coronation Declaration which formed, as it was, the sequel to this controversy, would provide a subject full of interest both to you and to myself. My selection of this subject was quite decided when I observed the interest manifested on all sides by the Orange order in the agitation for its abolition set afoot under the auspices of the "Catholic Truth Society" of this City.

I naturally interested myself very deeply in all that was to be said on the side of the Romanist for the abolition of this Declaration. I have read very carefully all that the learned and Rev. lecturer, who was selected by the society, has said upon the subject. The lecture was written undoubtedly by one who was inspired by a sense of honest indignation to protest against what he considered a most unjust and uncalled for insult hurled by England's people through their sovereign against the doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church, when the Coronation Declaration is repeated by the sovereign at his or her accession. His indignation becomes all the more pronounced when he considers that in England's world wide Empire, the Roman Catholic faith is the only one singled out for such gratuitous insult. It is pointed out that England not only does not say anything offensive of the religions of India for instance, but that she uses the most consummate tact in her endeavour to avoid giving offence. And then with commendable rhetorical effect the lecturer clinches his argument against the unreasonableness of this Declaration by indignantly demanding why different treatment should be accorded the Church of Rome.

The learned lecturer says "Brahmans exist in millions in India. Not only is their superstition not so stigmatized by the sovereign, or the sovereign's representatives, but the most scrupulous care is taken lest the Brahmanistic conscience should be in the least offended. No such regard is had for the beliefs of the oldest and most numerous body of Christians in the world."

That this is a very spacious form of reasoning I hope presently to be able to show.

Before we proceed further however it will be well to examine somewhat in detail this Coronation Declaration to which such strong exception is taken, and enquire briefly the circumstances which gave it birth.

The full text of the Declaration is as follows :—

"I, Victoria by the grace of God, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland, defender of the faith, do solemnly and sincerely in presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe that in the Sacrament of the Lord's supper there is not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration and each and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the pope, or any other authority or person whatsoever or without any hope of any such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the pope, or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

It would indeed be idle to affirm that the language here employed is not strong language. The more we study the terms in which the Declaration is couched the more firmly do we become convinced that every word has been well weighed, every sentence most carefully constructed. It is not the language of impetuous haste, but that of careful, judicial deliberation.

This very carefulness in drawing up the declaration compels us to one of two plain inferences, namely, either: 1st.—That the lecturer is more than justified in stating that this declaration is a deliberate and gratuitous insult to the adherents of the Papal Church, or 2nd.—That the framers of that Declaration were smarting under a sense of the most intolerable wrongs and injustice, which alone could justify such language.

We Canadians dwell in a land where nature speaks to us in majestic and resonant tones : a land whose undulating plains and pine clad forests, whose vast prairies and inland seas ; whose mighty rivers and cloud topped mountains, speak to us as with the trumpet tones of their Almighty Creator, bidding us to be broad and great like our environment. The plumage of the birds, the colour of the animal's fur is often the reflection of the haunts where they are found. And if there is one thing which distinguishes the Canadian more than another it is that large and comprehensive grasp which he possesses of things in general. In every city and town, yea in every hamlet and village of this broad Dominion are to be found men of the most opposite views political and religious, who nevertheless can; and do live side by side in terms of amity and friendship. Broad and tolerant as Canadians are, they would be first and foremost in supporting their Roman Catholic brethren in the maintenance of their rights.

Have we then, let us ask, just and sufficient reasons to oppose this agitation for the abolition of the Coronation Declaration, and were the framers of this Declaration justified in the use of the strong language in which it is couched ?

Perhaps the second question should be first answered.

It is a well known adage that violent diseases require strong remedies ; and it is on this principle that the Declaration admits of every justification. The Declaration is practically the same in substance as the "Test Act" which was passed in 1673, with the object of preventing political power being placed in the hands of papists. Its title is "an act for preventing dangers which may happen from papist recusants." Under the provisions of the act, all persons holding any office or place of trust, civil or military, were to receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Church of England and to make and subscribe the following declaration:—

"J. A. B. do declare that I believe there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever." The Parliamentary Test was imposed a few years later in the year 1678. The title of this act is—"An act for the more effectual preserving the King's person and government, by disabling papists from sitting in either House of Parliament." Under the provisions of this act—"No Peer or member of the house of commons shall sit or vote without taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and a declaration repudiating the doctrine of transubstantiation, the adoration of the Virgin, and the sacrifice of the Mass. These acts were repealed in the reign of George iv.

It will be seen at once that the Coronation Declaration, now made by the Sovereign only is simply an enlargement of these acts with a few alterations.

The Rev. Dr. Fallon in his lecture upon this subject says:—"It would seem to be our plain duty, for the interests of our religion and our honor, to do our best to remove forever from the statute books of an Empire, whose best interests we are ready to serve, this last remnant of bitter and barbarous times."

2 And what was it I ask you, that made those times bitter and barbarous ?

We are learning now, Roman Catholic and Protestant alike, thank God, to forget the bitterness and barbarity of those days ; but the men of the days of Charles II, of James II, and of William of Orange were not permitted to forget. The spirit which prompted the Papal power to introduce the first schism into England by the excommunication of Queen Elizabeth, and the beginning of the Italian Mission; the spirit which had earlier sanctioned the burning of 277 persons under Mary because of their refusal to conform to the Church of Rome, the spirit which brought the

ships of the Spanish Armada to overthrow England's throne, because it was occupied by a Queen whose unpardonable sin consisted in her refusal to recognise the Pope's supremacy, the spirit which prompted the Pope to absolve her subjects from their civil allegiance and incited them to rebel against their lawful Queen, and which, moreover, countenanced the several dastardly and cowardly attempts made upon her life. The spirit which again at a later time caused the Pope to absolve the subjects of James I. from their civil allegiance and which hatched the Gunpowder Plot during the same reign. The spirit which under Charles I. and Charles II. and later under James II., inspired the emissaries of Rome to use every artifice to play every trick, to stop at nothing in fact which might prove successful in restoring Papal power in England; the spirit which had spread dismay far and wide in the tortures of the Inquisition. *It was this spirit* manifesting itself just as actively in these as in the earlier reigns which drove the Protestants of England in sheer self defence to pass these last acts and this Coronation Declaration, and to adopt together with them such other expedients as were thought necessary for the preservation of their rights.

Our Romanist friends are shocked at the severity of the language employed and the harshness of some of the measures adopted.

I read a few days ago in our local papers an account of an attempted robbery. A burglar was about to effect an entrance into the house of a Roman priest, but was not aware of the fact that his preparations had been overheard by the Rev. Father, who was waiting for Mr. burglar's head to appear through the open window. The closed fist of the priest descended like lightning upon that head, and the priest closed the window and retired to bed. Violent disease requires strong remedies. The hand of a priest should only be raised to bless, but there may be occasions in his life when he has to strike.

It is surely small cause for wonder then that England, smarting as she was under the successive attempts of the Vatican to coerce the nation and rivet once again upon its neck the yoke of Papal despotism, should strike back vigorously, and even viciously, and make use of language in her legislative assemblies which seems to shock the sensitiveness of our Roman Catholic contemporaries.

Language is important to express their indignation at the indecency, the gratuitous insults, the outrage upon the most sacred principles of their faith which the Coronation Declaration contains.

Because transubstantiation, adoration of their Virgin Mary, and the sacrifice of the Mass are described therein as superstitious and idolatrous, the Queen, it is said, insults a large proportion of her most loyal subjects. If this be true what shall we say of that diabolical persecution under Queen Mary when nearly three hundred innocent and unoffending men, woman and Children were burnt at the stake for refusing to believe these very doctrines.

The historian Hume in his reference to this period says—"Instances of barbarity, so unusual in the nation, excited horror; the constancy of the martyrs was the object of admiration, and as men have a principle of equity engraven in their minds, which even false religion is not able totally to obliterate, they were shocked to see persons of probity, of honor, of pious dispositions, exposed to punishments more severe than were inflicted on the greatest ruffians for crimes subversion of civil society."

Though some other points were raised in the examination and trial of these martyrs, still the result of the trial really turned upon their admitting or denying the corporal or bodily presence of Christ in the Holy Communion, and transubstantiation—which says Collier (vi. 106) "were the burning articles through the whole reign." The burning of Bishop Ridley and Latimer, and afterwards of Cranmer during this reign, are not easily forgotten, and their cruel death was due simply and solely to their refusal to subscribe to these doctrines.

Is it to be wondered at therefore that when in 1689 the act was passed settling the succession of the monarch in a protestant Prince, the parliament should moreover require such succeeding Princes to give public proof of his Protestantism by openly repudiating those very doctrines to which the Church of Rome has always attached the greatest importance.

We respect, it is said, the feelings of the Brahman or the Hottentot, and reserve for Roman Catholics our bitterest insults.

The Brahman and the Hottentot have never attempted to thrust their doctrines down our throat: they have not burned and massacred loyal and true Englishmen by hundreds because they refused to believe their religious teachings. I think therefore that intelligent men will see that these facts do make a slight difference, and that the inference drawn by the lecturer in this matter is entirely without point.

Upon page 13 of this same lecture I find these words which supply me with an introduction to my next point.

"Now is there anything unreasonable in Roman Catholics moving to have this Declaration abolished? When we ask for absolute religious equality with all other Citizens of the Empire, are we making an exorbitant demand? We ask Protestants to deal with us in this matter as they should wish us to deal with them in similar circumstances." Now on the face of it this is a very fair and generous statement, and we should be lacking both in real manliness and true religion if we failed to respond to so fair an argument. It seems to say to us let by-gones be by-gones, let us forget the bitterness and barbarity of the times that are past, and begin anew from that higher ground which we occupy to-day. Would that we might so interpret this language; would that we might think and feel that Rome is as ready to forget and forgive as England is; would that

we could believe that the tumultuous waves of strife and controversy are subsiding and that the dove is returning with the olive branch of peace.

But an examination of Rome's side of the case compels us to the disappointing conclusion that some are crying "peace, peace, when there is no peace."

The spirit in which the demand for the abolition of the Coronation Declaration is made would lead us to suppose that Rome out of the depths of its Christian love and charity has repealed all its offensive laws against us.

Has the Pope ever erased a single line of his canon law in which he claims the power of deposing Princes and absolving subjects from their allegiance? Never. Has he ever revoked one of his unchristian anathemas against us and our Princes? Never. Has he ever ceased to impose his own oaths of allegiance and supremacy on Roman ecclesiastics who are subjects of the Queen of England, and to teach them that all the civil oaths to their sovereign, to the prejudice of his own interest, are perjuries? Never. And yet we are forsooth, to be called upon, to repeal all laws and declarations which are said to be offensive to Rome, and the principles which should inspire us to this end are said to be religious tolerations and the reasonableness of absolute religious equality. What kind of religious equality is that which demands everything from us and gives nothing in return? What kind of religious toleration is that which bids us forget and forgive the bitterness and injustice of the past, but yet takes particular delight in forgetting and forgiving nothing itself?

Was it or was it not, an unwarrantable interference with the prerogative of the English crown when Pope Leo III, in 1535, not only excommunicated King Henry VIII, but ordered his nobles to rebel against him?

To incite to rebellion is deemed a crime and punished as such, but in the case of a Pope it is evidently considered a virtue, since Pope Pius V, who pretended to depose Queen Elizabeth and to declare her subjects "forever absolved from any oath, and all manner of duty, allegiance and obedience to her," and commanded them, on pain of excommunication, "not to presume to obey her monitions mandates and laws," has been canonized as a saint by the Church of Rome.

Have any of the Popes since that time expressed the least regret for these insults hurled at the throne and people of England? Not one!

Again in the year 1640 Paul V, and 1671 Clemens X, anathematized all Protestant Princes and subjects as heretics, who by the Papal laws are not only incapable of possessing any civil power or rights but are amenable to temporal penalties and even death. This anathema has never been revoked, and is still to be found in the pages of the Roman Bullarium.

King James I and Charles I were treated with the same scant courtesy as Henry VIII, and Elizabeth, and the bulls which absolved their Roman Catholic subjects from their civil allegiance have never been repealed. And yet Roman Catholics grow indignant when their loyalty is called in question! Can we wonder at the suspicion which the throne and people of England harbour against the Papists, and that the legislature imposed certain restrictions upon them in consequence? On the contrary all honest and impartial men cannot fail to admire and respect the forbearance and dignified demeanour which marked the conduct and deportment of a people who were singled out for such bitter and harassing treatment.

This does not as yet however, represent the full measure of abuse which the Church of Rome heaps upon us.

I have yet to refer to a few more facts which prove conclusively that Rome forgets and forgives nothing in so far as Protestants are concerned.

The bull "in *Cæna Domini*," which is so called, because it is ordered to be read annually in every Romish Church on Maundy Thursday, the day on which our Saviour instituted His Sacramental Supper. It consists, you are aware, of a long series of imprecations (many of which are due to Pius V), renewed by above twenty different Popes, against all protestant Princes, parliament and people, whom it anathematizes as heretics, incapable by the papal law, not only of enjoying civil power and rights, but liable to temporal penalties, and even to death.

In the year 1688, the parliament at Paris affirmed, that by this bull the Popes declare themselves masters of the world, and Cardinal Erskine, auditor for Pope Pius VI, confessed in a letter to Sir J. C. Hippisley, (August 1793) that "although the formality of its publication at Rome is now omitted out of a compliment to some Princes, to whom some parts of the said bull are obnoxious, yet it is implicitly in vigour in all its extensions, and is likewise observed in all cases where there is no impediment to the exertion of the Popes authority. As far then as regards, this bull, which anathematizes all Protestants, it is recited every year in the course of Divine Service in all Roman Catholic Churches:—"It is implicitly in vigour in all its extension."

Let me recite one more example of Rome's determination to retract nothing which relates to the Protestant world.

One of the most solemn acts of Divine worship is an oath. When we impose one on others, or take an oath ourselves, we acknowledge and adore God's omniscience, we appeal to Him as knowing the secrets of all hearts, we confess Him as the just and Almighty Governor of all the world, as the future Judge of all men, and as the great avenger of all violations of truth and equity. And if an oath can be said to be more sacred than another, surely it is that which a Christian Church requires to

be taken by a Minister at the time of ordination. Let us see then what the Pope requires of his Bishops. In the Roman Pontifical, printed at Rome by authority in the year 1818, and in page 62 of that volume will be found the form of the oath to be taken by every Roman Catholic Bishop at his consecration.

In it he swears "to be faithful and obedient to his Lord the Pope and his successors: to assist them in maintaining the Roman papacy and the royalties of St. Peter against all men: to preserve, defend, augment, and promote its rights, honours, and privileges: to *persecute and impugn*, with all his might, heretics and schismatics, and rebels against his said lord."

But why should I multiply examples of Roman defiant and unrelenting attitude towards us poor heretics. Enough and more than enough is given here, and still the list is not fully declared upon which Rome has inscribed in indelible characters her hatred and unflinching attitude.

England's Monarchs are to be deposed and cowed into submission to the papal will by the fulminations of the vatican, and we are supposed to submit like lambs: we may be branded as heretics and cursed and anathematised just whenever the Pope takes it into his head to do so. Our Parliaments do not escape the Popes wrath either: and so year after year, on Maundy Thursday, the bull in Coena Domini, reminds us that these curses apply not only to the bones and shadows of our departed ancestors, but also to their unhappy progeny. Each time a bishop is consecrated he swears to persecute and impugn us, but we "miserable heretics" are not to say a word.

But when in self defence we venture to expostulate, we are guilty of everything that is dreadful. To express an honest opinion regarding doctrines which Englishmen were compelled to accept at the point of the sword, and for denying which thousands were persecuted and slain, we are said to be guilty of the grossest insults.

The language of the old Puritans when speaking of the Church of England, was not always couched in the nicest or choicest of terms. They spoke and wrote as men usually do when smarting under injustice and wrongs, and we cannot blame them. And it is simply nonsensical for a Roman Catholic to work himself up over this Coronation Declaration and to agitate for its abolition, unless Rome is satisfied to meet us half way by erasing from her laws, her statutes and her bullarium all those offensive and insulting declarations regarding the Protestant world.

The feelings which we entertain for our Roman Catholic neighbors are of the kindest possible character. We want to co-operate with them in all and everything that makes for peace and good will, and we mean no offence when we express our determination to oppose the agitation for the abolition of this declaration.

The Protestant succession to the throne of England is the dearest fact to the heart of an Englishman, but without this declaration the nation would have no assurance of the monarch's religious belief.

History teaches us only too plainly that in the matter of conscience some monarchs are very much like some of their subjects, and the experience of England in its relations with Rome have been of too hopeless and disappointing a nature to be persuaded into adopting a policy which would admit even of the remotest possibility of a papist monarch succeeding to the British Throne. There was too much coquetting with the papal court under both Charles I. and Charles II; and the bitter period of James II. taught Englishmen a lesson which we of to-day would be more than fools to forget. Toleration may reach a stage when it degenerates into a weak and unmanly subserviency; charity may degenerate into a miserable sentimentalism, and it would be neither toleration nor charity which would abolish this Coronation Declaration but only their miserable counterfeit. We pretend to a greater wisdom than our fathers, but it would be hypocrisy to pretend to a manlier or more robust faith. They shed their blood for the faith and liberty of which we are reaping the harvest to-day, and shall we stultify their memory, shall we belittle their greatness, shall we heap scorn upon their lives, by tearing down the very bulwarks which they erected for the protection of their faith, their nation, and their sovereign?



